

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 22 2007

REMARKS

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The Examiner objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for claim 18. In response, the Applicant has introduced new paragraph [0054], which describes a computer-readable storage medium and that corresponds to the subject matter recited in claim 18 as well as paragraphs [0011], [0027], and [0030] as filed. The introduction of paragraph [0054] does not constitute new matter as an originally filed claim (*i.e.*, claim 18) constitutes its own written description. See *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 263 (CCPA 1976). The MPEP concurs in that "[i]t is . . . well accepted that a satisfactory description may be in the claims or any other part of the originally filed specification." MPEP § 2163(I). As such, a new matter rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 132 is not warranted and the objection is overcome.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Examiner objects to claims 18-25 for failing to comply with the *INTERIM GUIDELINES FOR EXAMINATION OF PATENT APPLICATIONS FOR PATENT SUBJECT MATTER ELIGIBILITY*. In accordance with the Examiner's suggestion and the *INTERIM GUIDELINES*, the Applicant has amended the preamble of claims 18-25 to recite a "computer-readable storage medium having embodied thereon a program, the program being executable by a machine to perform a method for . . ." Through this amendment, the claims correspond to the *INTERIM GUIDELINES* that state "a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a data structures defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components"; this interrelationship "permit[s] the data structure's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory." Interim Guidelines, Annex IV(a). As such, the objection is overcome.

35 U.S.C. § 102(B) REJECTIONS

The Examiner rejects all pending claims as being anticipated by U.S. patent number 5,717,848 to Wantanabe et al. The Applicant respectfully disagrees as set forth herein.

Wantanabe et al. pertains (generally) to creating object motion paths in a computer graphics system. In contrast, the Applicant's amended claims recite, *inter alia*, a graphical path in a video game that has been traversed by a game object; vectors are calculated as a part of the game object having traversed that graphical path. Those calculated vectors are then displayed "as a visual string of colored path markers," as is recited in (for example) amended claim 1. "[T]he color of each of the path markers . . . indicat[es] a computed vector from amongst the . . . computed vectors"; the computed vectors, in turn, "affect[] the motion of the game object during a subsequent traversal of the graphical path." Through this amendment, the Applicant has more clearly identified how the display of the path markers along a graphical path in a video game may be illustrative of various vector forces in a game environment, which is absent from the disclosure of Wantanabe et al.

For example, a graphical path on a mountain includes a rock. Running into that rock with, for example, a game character riding a mountain bike will result in certain force vectors acting upon the bike. Through amended claim 1 (in the present example), a user 'rides the mountain' a first time (the game object traverses the graphical path) and various vector forces are calculated based on that 'run' ('computing a plurality of vectors along one or more graphical paths'). That is, what objects (such as the aforementioned rock) did the user encounter and how did those objects affect the physics of that downhill run?

The calculated vector forces are then displayed in a subsequent run as a series of path markers ('displaying the plurality of computed vectors along the one or more graphical paths as a visual string of colored path markers'). By displaying these colored path markers, which correspond to the particular physics of the graphical path ('the color of each of the path markers in the visual string of path markers indicating a computed vector from amongst the plurality of computed vectors'), a user can make better decisions with respect to subsequently traversing the environment by avoiding those portions of the path that have vectors that negatively affect performance such as mud or gravel. Instead, the game player can focus on those portions of the path that may contribute to a more enjoyable game experience such as jumps or fast portions of the path ('wherein the computed vector affects the motion of the game object during a subsequent traversal of the graphical path'). The Applicant references FIGURE 5e and paragraphs [0018], [0031], [0035], and [0036] as providing (at the least) the requisite support for these amendments.

Wantanabe et al. makes no reference to path markers or the color coding of such markers with respect to particular vector forces. Further, there is no discussion of calculating the vectors of a first 'run' and displaying those calculated vectors during a subsequent 'run.' Wantanabe et al. is concerned only with the vectors involved in the display of a graphic object (e.g., a baseball being hit in a baseball game and flying off the bat and across the ball park). The Applicant believes that the present amendments sufficiently distinguish the Applicant's claimed invention from the narrow scope of the cited art and that the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection is overcome.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 22 2007

CONCLUSION

The Examiner's rejections of the independent claims are overcome in that the cited references fail to teach each and every limitation of the claims.

The references of record fail to disclose, at the least, computing a plurality of vectors along one or more graphical paths in a video game. The cited references further fail to disclose a game object having previously traversed the graphical path and displaying the vectors computed as a result of that traversal as a visual string of colored path markers. The cited references further fail to disclose the computed vectors (as identified by the path markers) as affecting the motion of the game object during a subsequent traversal of the path.

As such, the cited art fails to anticipate the independent claims and the Examiner's rejections are overcome. The dependent claims are allowable, at the least, through their dependence upon one of the aforementioned independent claims. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests the passage of the present application to allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative with any questions concerning this matter.

Respectfully submitted,
Scott Campbell

February 22, 2007

By:

Kenneth M. Kaslow

Kenneth M. Kaslow, Reg. No. 32,246
CARR & FERRELL LLP
2200 Geng Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303
T: 650.812.3400
F: 650.812.3444